



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,409	10/17/2000	Hans-Peter Wild	357153/0004	3320
26610	7590	07/15/2008	EXAMINER	
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP			TRUONG, THANH K	
180 MAIDEN LANE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK, NY 10038			3721	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/690,409	Applicant(s) WILD ET AL.
	Examiner THANH K. TRUONG	Art Unit 3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7,9 and 11-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7,9 and 11-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No.(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on April 11, 2008.
2. Applicant's cancellation of claims 1-6, 8 and 10 is acknowledged.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 7-10 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,547 in view of Geyssel (4,584,046). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other, and the additional limitations that are added to the claims in the present application can be rejected in view of the Geyssel reference (4,584,046). In this instance case, Geyssel discloses and suggests,

among other things, the method steps of: providing a plurality of straws above the conveyor belt, providing straws at an acute angle the conveyor belt or providing straws substantially parallel to a side wall of the bag.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified the U.S. Patent No. 6,681,547 by incorporating the method as taught by Geyssel to provide a more effective method of applying drinking straws onto the stand up bag.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 7, 9 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyssel (4,584,046) in view of Wild (4,572,758).

Geyssel discloses (figures 1-10) an apparatus and a method comprising:

providing a plurality of standup bag 12;

positioning a bag on a conveyor belt (13) so that the second side wall is at an acute angle with the conveyor belt (figure 9);

applying a straw package (11) onto the second side wall an acute angle to the conveyor belt (figure 9).

providing a plurality of straw packages from above the conveyor belt (Fig. 1 of Geyssel clearly shows that the straw packages are located on a higher elevation than the conveyor belt with respect to the ground, which supports the entire apparatus);

providing a transfer drum (20) above the conveyor belt, the transfer drum being rotatable about an axis substantially parallel to the second side wall (Fig. 1 of Geyssel clearly shows that the transfer drum is located on a higher elevation than the conveyor belt with respect to the ground, which supports the entire apparatus);

providing a lever having a depressing arm (41a) and a pivoting arm (49);

rotating the pivoting arm of the lever to displace the depressing arm downward toward the conveyor belt to apply a straw package onto the second side wall at an acute angle to the conveyor belt (figures 1 and 6 of Geyssel – column 4, lines 62-68 and column 5, lines 1-14);

Geyssel discloses, column 1, lines 43-47, that:

"It is the task of this invention to create a system with which objects, in particular drinking straws, labels, or the like, can be attached to objects such as packages, bottles, bags, etc., these being moved past on a conveyor belt..." (emphasis added),

and on column 1, lines 6-8, that:

"This invention relates to a device for attaching articles such as labels, drinking straws or the like to packages, bottles or other objects" (emphasis added),

and in the Abstract:

"The applicator device (10) can be tilted about two perpendicular directions and can be secured in order that the drinking straws (11) can be secured in different directions and on variously inclined surfaces of the package (12)" (emphasis added),

and on column 2, lines 19-31, that:

"It is expedient that the applicator element can be tipped in several directions in order that the article that has been made ready can be applied in various positions and on variously configured objects as selected ... the applicator element and the drive system are installed together on a carrier that can be tilted about two perpendicular axes and which can be secured ... the applicator element can be placed in any desired angular position against the objects to which the articles are to be secured" (emphasis added).

It is further construed that Geyssel clearly teaches and suggests the apparatus and method steps in which: the bag (12) includes the bag as recited in the Applicant's present claimed invention, and the drinking straws can be applied to the bag (of any design configuration) at any desired angular position with respect to the conveyor surface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified Geyssel apparatus and method to provide the foil bag as recited in the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Geyssel discloses the claimed invention, but it does not expressly disclose the straw packages having an adhesive thereon and a cover strip covering the adhesive.

Wild discloses an apparatus and a method comprising: the straw packages having an adhesive thereon and a cover strip covering the adhesive (column 2, lines 22-29) in which the adhesive strip (29) is applied on the straw package (12) prior to the step of applying the straw package onto the second side wall of the container (bag). Wild provides "a process and apparatus for increasing the yield of straws affixed to

beverage containers by providing an adhesive on the straw packages" (Wild – column 2, lines 46-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified Geyssel apparatus and method by incorporating the apparatus and method as taught by Wild to provide a more effective machine and method of attaching drinking straws onto containers.

Geyssel modified by Wild further discloses the method and apparatus that includes the steps of removing the cover strip from the plurality of straw packages and exposing the adhesive as recited (column 2, lines 22-29).

7. Examiner's note: additionally, regarding claims 13 and 14, also refer to the Final Office Action mailed on April 23, 2003 for the rejection of the apparatus claims 1-6 (now have been canceled), which are believed to contain the same scope and invention as claims 13 and 14. If the Applicant to argue that the now cancelled claims 1-6 and the claims 13 and 14 are not contained the same scope and invention, the Applicant is advised to point out the differences, and if that is the case, a restriction will apply to claims 13 and 14 in the future office action.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 7, 9 and 11, 13-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3721

9. Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

10. In response to the Applicant's argument that:

"Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geyssel in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,572,758 to Wild (Wild). Applicants respectfully maintain that Wild fails to remedy the shortcomings of Geyssel, and also fails to teach or suggest a "foil bag having a triangular cross section" and two pieces of film connected "along three edges thereof" as claimed. In contrast, Wild is directed toward "cans or folded paper container bags," which is more rigid and balanced than the foil bags as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Geyssel and Wild, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to render claim 12 unpatentable.",

this is not found persuasive for the following reason: Wild is relied upon for the teaching of the straw packages having an adhesive thereon and a cover strip covering the adhesive (column 2, lines 22-29) and the adhesive strip is applied on the straw package prior to the step of applying the straw package onto the second side wall of the container (bag).

11. In response to the Applicant's argument, regarding the Double Patenting rejection, that:

"Applicants respectfully submit that Geyssel does not claim providing a foil bag having film pieces attached to create a triangular cross section or providing a plurality of straws having adhesives thereon and a cover strip covering the adhesive as required in claims 7-10 as amended herein. At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 7-10 are patentably distinct from claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 17 of Geyssel and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.".

this is not found persuasive for the following reason: as discussed above, it is maintains that Geyssel clearly teaches and suggests the apparatus and method steps in which: the bag (12) includes the bag as recited in the Applicant's present claimed invention,

and Geyssel clearly suggests that it is fully capable of applying the drinking straw onto the bag (of any design configuration) at any desired angular position with respect to the conveyor surface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to have modified Geyssel apparatus and method to provide the foil bag as recited in the claimed invention.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THANH K. TRUONG whose telephone number is (571)272-4472. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

tkt
July 13, 2008.

/Thanh K Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721.